

11592

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

July 9

CUBAN LIBERATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on June 17 I offered in this Chamber a proposal for Cuban liberation. My motives were, in the deepest sense, nonpolitical and nonpartisan. I spoke then, and again today, as one profoundly disturbed American—but with the special obligation of representing in this highest court of public deliberation what I judge to be the firm will of the American people.

My proposal was offered explicitly—and I reiterate the point today—as one possible course of action, designed to fulfill our Government's own repeated pledge to restore to the Cuban people their shattered liberties. It was designed not to assert this Nation's authority over Cuba's destiny—we have no such authority—but to extend to the Cuban people an opportunity to resume their own sovereign course within the free world community. It was offered as one way to fulfill President Kennedy's own pledge that Cuba must once more be free.

One possible course of action—I repeat and underscore these words. Not the only or even necessarily the best course of action, but one that would capitalize on our unique strengths and would thus move us out of the shoals of endless procrastination and toward our avowed goals. My proposal was offered in direct response to the administration's repeated challenge to all the critics of its Cuba policy, ever since the moral and military disaster of the Bay of Pigs: What alternative do you offer? What would you have us do?

Here, in the form of a proposal for Cuban liberation, was one alternative—simple, serious, and with full awareness of this Nation's complex obligations—legal, diplomatic, and moral. In proposing that we both challenge and stimulate the fragmented forces of free Cuba to express their differences and then to speak head their ultimate self-liberation, I was responding to the administration's appeal. In proposing that we offer a sanctuary and a territorial base at Guantanamo Bay to a broadly representative free Cuban provisional government, in proposing that we then recognize this strictly interim government as the sole legitimate agent of Cuban sovereignty, I was attempting to offer one responsible alternative to the administration's policy of futile and timid indecision.

My proposal of June 17, for clarification, was offered as a stimulus for reasoned debate and deliberation—ultimately to decide and effectively. But what has been the result? First, silence. To this day, no official administration spokesman has come forward with either an effective critique or a better alternative. Then some nameless and faceless "anonymous" in the State Department began to respond: He called my proposal "insane." I must admit to be that the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of this body's Committee on Foreign Relations did not

proposal simply as "insane." By now, responses had escalated to "foolish, dangerous, imprudent, and ill considered," with the charge of "illegal" tossed in for good measure.

But let me not be misunderstood: It is not offended personal pride that moves me to reply. Such a consideration is less than minor. What is important—supremely important, is this Nation's security. What matters is this Nation's honor in the free world community—and its credibility within the walls of the Kremlin. What matters is the value of this Nation's pledged word in the councils of world opinion. And what matters is the dignity of the U.S. Senate as a responsible assembly of deliberation, debate, and decision.

All these considerations are of overriding importance, now that the senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. Monrath) has chosen to spread upon the record what we can only assume is the administration's considered response to a proposal for Cuban liberation. This tangle of irrational conclusions cannot go unanswered. And I repeat that what is at stake is, equally, this Nation's security and the honor of its solemn word. If the world's greatest deliberative assembly is to fulfill its high mission, we must first pause to consider the administration's case—and then get on with the great tasks before us. If the administration will not make good its own pledges, it is up to the U.S. Senate to assume the burden of responsible decision.

The subcommittee chairman begins by asking "Who is to decide upon the composition" of what he chooses to call a government-in-exile, and "where is such a government to derive any right to claim to be the government of the Cuban people?" Let me suggest that the Senate study the record: The proposal for Cuban liberation could not be more explicit.

First, it challenges the leaders of the Cuban expatriates themselves to reconcile their differences; to unite behind the one goal of national liberation; and to demonstrate that they are, indeed, broadly and truly representative of all democratic groups and parties in pre-Castro Cuba.

Second, the proposal contemplates no government-in-exile at all, in the traditional sense, but rather a provisional government with but two mandates: To spearhead the ultimate liberation of their homeland; and to prepare the way for free elections by the whole Cuban people—after which their work would be done.

And if such an interim government is not legitimately discharge its mandate, as clearly in the all freedom-loving Cubans, in the Castro-Communist regime, ultimately represent anyone at their own masters in the administration. There is no doubt that since January 1959, contrary to Castro's solemn word, the Cuban State, and nothing else, has been manipulated in power by Soviet-backed manipulation in world councils as a

Declaration on the Offensive of Communism in America, proclaimed at Punta del Este in January 1962, and subscribed to by every free republic of the Americas, the Castro regime has usurped the sovereignty of the Cuban people. It is in blatant contempt of every requirement for legitimate democratic rule, as specified in sections 3 and 4 of that declaration of hemispheric policy.

I must also ask this defender of the administration—and I must presume that is what he is—to consider a further fact: if he is now so outraged by the possibility of the United States—as he puts it—"picking" and "choosing" a free Cuban government, what does he conceive to have been the purpose of our disastrous operation at the Bay of Pigs? We have the word of one of the highest administration officials, of the Attorney General himself, that its precise purpose was to secure a beachhead for a provisional government—one that most certainly would have been, to use the Senator's word again, an American "puppet." And this, expressly, is what my proposal seeks to avoid.

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Monrath) in his reply next points out that, in every past case of U.S. recognition of exile governments, there were in existence duly constituted regimes that had been forcibly ejected from their own territory. Were the free French such a duly constituted government? Was De Gaulle forcibly ejected? But these are relatively minor points. What is important is that no one then seriously questioned the legitimate right of these free governments—the French, the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians—in representing the aspirations of their people for ultimate liberation, for the restoration of their freedom, and for the chance to reassert the privileges of national sovereignty. And today, no one could seriously doubt the parallel claim of a free Cuban provisional government. The Senator's suggestion that the highly discredited Batista regime is "the only group we could possibly recognize as a Cuban government in exile" is frivolous—and it flies in the face of the historical record. It reduces the niceties of law to a shameful absurdity.

The Senator tacitly concedes the frivolity of this argument by turning now to a most curious, tortured, and unconvincingly or not—a most revealing, thin of reasoning. He says:

I do not think many people realize that it is a matter of international law, the United States still recognizes the Castro government of Cuba.

I agree with him. But let me say: do not realize this fact, and a shocking realization it must be. We choose to play this immoral game—and let me ask: What reason? I quote again from the distinguished subcommittee chairman:

It is the Government which is responsible for living up to Cuba's international obligations. What obligations? What responsibility?

The record is clear—every known scrap of it. This is a hand manipulated in power by Soviet-backed manipulation in world councils as a